

Application Number 09/871,046  
Responsive to Office Action mailed July 19, 2005

### **REMARKS**

This amendment is responsive to the Final Office Action dated July 19, 2005. Applicant has amended claim 34. Claims 1-42 are pending.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for discussing the Final Office Action via telephonic interview on September 22, 2005. Examiner Backhean Tiv and Mr. Sieffert participated in the interview. During the telephonic interview, the Applicant and the Examiner discussed: (i) a proposed amendment to claim 34 consistent with the current amendment, and (ii) the current rejection of claims 34-42. Applicant and the Examiner the fact the cited references fail to discuss a router that emits replies in either a rendered or an unrendered form in response to a selection by a user. Applicant agreed to amend claim 34 to clarify that the router emits replies in the rendered form or the unrendered form based on a user selection of the form

Agreement was reached that the proposed amendment overcomes the art of record, and the Examiner agreed to reconsider the application in view of a response from the Applicant. The Applicant pointed out that the proposed amendment does not introduce new matter nor require a new search in view of the currently pending dependent claims. For example, claim 6 includes limitations requiring the selection made by the user includes user input indicated a desire to present the replies in an unrendered form.

### **Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 34-39 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bixler et al. (USPN 6,212,559) in view of Anderson et al. (USPN 6,510,434) in further view of Ozzie et al. (USPN 6,640,241). For reasons set forth in the previously filed response and incorporated herein by reference, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. The applied references fail to disclose or suggest the inventions defined by Applicant's claims, and provide no teaching that would have suggested the desirability of modification to arrive at the claimed invention.

As discussed above, the Applicant and the Examiner agreed that the proposed amendment overcomes the current rejection of claims 34-39.

Application Number 09/871,046  
Responsive to Office Action mailed July 19, 2005

**Provisional Rejection for Obviousness-type Double Patenting:**

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 1-5, 10, 12-16, 21, 23-27, 32, 34-39 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-7, 11 of copending Application No. 09/871,458 in view of USPN 6,640,241 issued to Ozzie et al. Applicants note the provisional status of this rejection. Accordingly, Applicants will address this issue if and when the rejection is formally applied.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1-33 would be allowable if the double patenting rejection is overcome. The Applicant agrees with the Examiner's conclusion.

**CONCLUSION**

All claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 50-1778. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application.

Date:

By:

September 26, 2005  
SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.  
8425 Seasons Parkway, Suite 105  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55125  
Telephone: 651.735.1100  
Facsimile: 651.735.1102

Kent J. Sieffert  
Name: Kent J. Sieffert  
Reg. No.: 41,312